1-1-2008

Female and male student leadership characteristics: Differences & similarities

Amber Mishala Shaverdi
Eastern Illinois University

FEMALE AND MALE STUDENT LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS: DIFFERENCES & SIMILARITIES

SHAVERDI

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow these to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Amber M Sbaardi May 16, 2008

Author's Signature Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University **NOT** allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Author's Signature Date

This form must be submitted in duplicate.

FEMALE AND MALE STUDENT LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS: DIFFERENCES & SIMILARITIES

(TITLE)

BY

AMBER MISHALA SHAVERDI

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER'S OF SCIENCE IN COLLEGE STUDENT AFFAIRS

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2008
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

5-15-08
DATE

Daniel P. Wadley
THESIS DIRECTOR

5-15-08
DATE

DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL HEAD

FEMALE AND MALE STUDENT LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS DIFFERENCES & SIMILARITIES

By

Amber Mishala Shaverdi

THESIS

SUMBITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER'S OF SCIENCE IN COLLEGE STUDENT AFFIARS
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLNOIS

2008

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUTE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

5/15/08	Daniel P. Nalle
Date	Thesis Director
5/15/08	Angela M. Gabel
Date	Thesis Committee Member
May 15, 2008	Lisa V. Kasmer
Date	Thesis Committee Member
5-15-08	Ron Rogers
Date	Department Chair

ABSTRACT

Title of thesis: FEMALE AND MALE STUDENT LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS DIFFERENCES & SIMILARITIES

Thesis directed by: Dr. Daniel P. Nadler
Vice President for Student Affairs
Assistant Professor

Females and males differ in a variety of areas, yet these genders also have similar qualities. Are these similarities and differences affecting our college environment? In this research thesis the researcher set out to gather data that identifies the similarities and differences among undergraduate student leaders at a mid-sized Midwest public institution. The researcher first identifies student involvement and the many advantages for students who choose to be involved in co-curricular activities. Literature is presented highlighting a variety of theories that identify gender differences among females and males. The theories range from male masculinity, cognitive development, and societal gender roles. By creating a foundation of gender theory the researcher further explains theories regarding gender leadership. The literature creates a hypothesis and seg-ways into the study conducted by the researcher. A study of eighty-four undergraduate student leaders involved in one of three student organizations; residence hall council, student activities programming board, or student government. An electronic survey containing forty survey items with six leadership themes provided the researcher data that was used for six One-Way ANOVA tests, which identified statistical significance among the six leadership themes. The differences and similarities are then discussed within the conclusion.

Acknowledgements

During my two years at Eastern Illinois University I have been incredibly fortunate to work with great professionals and learn from prestigious professors. All of these professionals and professors encouraged me to attain my highest potential in all aspects of student affairs. I am thankful to each individual for their support, guidance, and encouragement. I greatly appreciate the time and effort that each person gave me!

While creating this thesis a group of individuals guided me through the process and for that I must acknowledge them individually. First my thesis chair, Dr. Nadler I appreciate your time and guidance as I found my way through the elements of research. I also want to thank Dr. Yoder and President Emeritus Lou Hencken for your patience, understanding, and support. Without your support I would not have been as successful. The lessons I learned from both of you have truly made me a better persona and professional.

I would also like to thank some of my friends. Without my friends and colleagues I would not have survived thesis or graduate school. My roommate Lori Morrissette, I appreciate your perspective, advice, and knowledge. You provided your friendship, support, and listening skills to me every night! Also I would like to thank Erica Roa, who kept me balanced. We shared so many great experiences while in graduate school and I can't wait for the future. I will miss working with you everyday. Finally I want to thank Brian Clarke, my friend and advisor. Brian you answered every question for me and helped me through a truly challenging part of life. Finally, Erika Butts, Samantha Kunshek, and Jenna Wheeler for being wonderful friends and cheerleaders.

My professional experience was an integral part of my graduate experience. Eric Davidson and Rachel Fisher gave me insight into the professional world, by allowing me to be my own person. I thank you both for the confidence and trust you gave me.

Also I need to acknowledge and thank my mentor, Ed Wirthwein. I would not be the person I am today with out your guidance. Ed you have always believed in me and I will always look to you as my mentor.

Lastly I want to thank my fiancé and family. My family has allowed me to venture off into my many paths. It has been difficult to be away from each of you, but I truly appreciate the love you have given me. I want to thank Aunt Pat, Becky, Amy, Ella, Andy, and my mom. The emails, cards, phone calls, support, and love meant the world to me. I especially want to thank Andy and my mom for supporting me, while I was a student and always pushing me. I love both of you tremendously and thank you for your constant love.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis in memory of my Grannie, Ms. Mary H. Schubert. I think of you every day. You were truly a brave woman who accomplished feats unheard of in your generation. Your accomplishments serve as inspiration to me. I believe in my heart that you are watching me as I aspire towards my goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICIES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Introduction to the Research Problem

A focus of many university communities is to develop well-rounded students who are comfortable in society, equipped with scholarly information, and prepared to conquer their goals. That community also maintains an environment that enhances the professional and personal development of students, faculty, and staff. The environment is affected by issues of enrollment, management, distance learning, virtual classrooms, and demographics, which in turn affect the opportunities for personal growth of students.

Universities also strive to provide students with opportunities that encourage personal growth through a variety of curricular and co-curricular programs that focus on student development, intellectual growth, and culture. Past research has generally supported the idea that involvement in co-curricular activities has a positive impact on the students' evaluation of their college lives. Arnold (2004) found that students who were active in co-curricular activities scored higher on measures of interdependence, educational plans, career plans, and lifestyle plans than students who were not involved.

Hernandez, Hogan, Hathaway, and Lovell (1999) described student involvement as "athletics, Greek organizations, general activities, organizations, on-campus living, out-of-class involvement with faculty, peer interaction, and employment" (p. 125). Kuh and Lund (1994) also noted the growth of students citing that "learning and personal development are enhanced when students are more actively engaged in educationally purposeful out-of-class activities" (p. 136).

It is important to recognize the outcomes students attribute to involvement in college. Many studies show that students' involvement will be more likely to have a positive impact on their academic development, general knowledge, and analytical and critical thinking skills than a student who is not involved in co-curricular activities. Kuh and Lund (1994) reported that "more than seventy percent of what students learn during college was attributed to out-of-class experiences" (p.126).

Terenzini and Pascarella (1994) have concluded that the greatest impact on student learning may stem from the students total level of campus engagement, particularly when "academic, interpersonal, and co-curricular involvements are mutually supporting and relevant" (p. 31). Those out of the class experiences can range from social clubs, marching band, writing for the university newspaper, or even collaborating on a research project. Astin (1984) concluded, based on a number of studies of student involvement, that "the greater the students' involvement in college, the greater will be the amount of student learning and personal development" (p.307). Research confirms the positive relationship of college student involvement of out-of-class experiences with academic achievement, satisfaction, communication skills, and self-esteem.

Studies have examined men and their masculinity, more specifically the role of male peer pressure, which often includes a strong anti-intellectual component. Kezar & Moriaty (2000) found reality supporting the theory that men are to be athletic and good looking, not intelligent and involved. Becoming involved on campus is not a priority or seen as a necessity by many or some male students. Harper (2005) states that "Alternative expressions of manliness, such as doing well in school or participating in non-sports related school activities, must be approved by other male peer group members" (p. 91) . Harper also observed that males who are class presidents are not perceived to be as manly as males who are athletic. More often the men who are competitive and win on the athletic field are more sought after by peers and romantic interests. Harper (2005) also reviewed expectations of society. "Society has historically suggested that boys should play sports, suppress outward displays of emotion, and compete rigorously against each other" (p.92).

Luzzo (1995) observed the beginnings of the concern. Luzzo explored the gender differences of college students and their maturity. He selected a large state university in southern California. About 75% of students were 20 years of age or younger. The qualitative study used 401 participants which examined how they prepared for their careers. Analyses revealed that female students were more involved for the purpose of personal development. "When asked to recount their process of career development over the past few years, women routinely revealed a well planned

process in everything-- the decision to attend college, the choice of major, the choice of career aspirations, and the choice of their student activities" (p. 321). The study also concluded that male students did not see the reason to become active. Male students gave the opinion that they were "not concerned with their future plans or how to develop the skills they would need in the future" (p. 322). From this particular study it can be observed that personal development and student involvement are not priorities with a number of college men. Harper (2006) described the need for change, "to shift the culture, it is essential for the institution to highlight and provide male advisement" (p. 21). Research supports the theory that if advisement and mentoring are part of the campus culture, males are more involved.

A study conducted by Harper, Carini, Bridges, and Hayek (2004) at Historically Black colleges and universities (HBCU's) sought to identify differences in student engagement between women and men. The data was collected from 1,167 African American undergraduate students at twelve four-year HBCU's that participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). In their study to identify possible gender differences in student engagement the researchers examined the differences between the engagement between females and males among eight dimensions, which ranged from academic challenge, collaborative learning, campus environment, student-faculty interaction, self-reported gains, and student satisfaction. The researchers identified two significant differences between females and males; academic challenge and student-faculty interaction. More specifically females, reported significantly higher academic rigor than males and males reported higher interaction with faculty. The researchers did not find a statistically significant difference in the dimensions of collaborative learning, campus environment, self-reported gains, or satisfaction.

Purpose of the Present Study

The purpose of the present study was to have an understanding of the similarities and differences of leadership characteristics of female and male student leaders that are involved in residence hall council, student government, and student activities programming board at a midsized Midwestern university. The research literature was limited in the area of previous studies. However previous research existed in regards to men and masculinity and gender development. Each of the previous studies targeted different populations and had different research questions.

Statement of the Problem

Recently there has been a new area of interest in the higher education community; the possible decline of male leadership and student involvement. The purpose of this research is to first study leadership characteristics. Currently a lack of research exists in the area of male and female leadership styles. Other researchers had recently researched the current trends of student leadership, which raised concern for the styles of advisement, motivation, and training.

"While some gender gaps have diminished among the pre-college population, differences in the characteristics of women and men have not completely dissipated, causing some higher education researchers to examine this gender gap over the span of college" (Harper & Sax, 2007, 237). Researchers who have examined the gender gap have found that differences originate prior to college and are reinforced throughout the college experience. Research comparing boys and girls prior to college entry reveal the early origin of gender differences on various levels. An example is according to the AAUW, boys are taught at a young age to be more physical and physically competitive, while girls are much less active especially after the onset of puberty. (AAUW, 1998, p.20) "The difference has negative implications in other areas since physical activity is associated with the development of competitive and leadership skills, higher self-esteem, positive body image, and lifelong health" (Harper & Sax, 2007, p.671)

Research has reported that among entering college freshmen, women spend significantly more time than men on responsibility-oriented activities such as

volunteer work, studying, student clubs, and household duties, where as men devote significantly more time than the women to exercise, sports, and watching television, activities that are likely to reduce stress and promote relaxation. As revealed in Harper & Sax's 2007 study, women have greater involvement in volunteer based organizations and have stronger commitment to the goals of social activism. "Educational institutions also can play a role in reducing the game in students' self-assessed leadership potential" (Harper & Sax, 2007, p. 689). Women's confidence in their leadership abilities remains significantly lower than men's. This can be related back to the relationship of leadership with competitiveness. Traditionally leadership was associated with hierarchy. Astin and Leeland (1991) define leadership as collaborative and inclusive. Research has suggested that institutions should offer leadership positions that are not seen as hierarchal, which allow more opportunities for women to lead on campus (Arnold, 2004).

Research Questions

Through the study of female and male student leaders in residence hall councils, student government, and student activities programming board, the following research questions were explored.

1. Do female and male student leaders possess different leadership characteristics?
2. What are the differences and if there are, are the differences statistically significant?
3. In what type of student leadership do males and females become involved?

Sample Population

The sample population for the current study was undergraduate men and women who were members of residence hall council, student government, and student activities programming board at a midsized Midwestern university. Participants were selected on the basis of equal opportunity for membership of male and female membership. All of these members were given the opportunity to voluntarily participate in the study.

Site

The midsized Midwestern University is a fully accredited comprehensive research institution located in a city of about 20,000 residents. The university has an enrollment of slightly more than 12,000 students. The university has the capacity to house 40% of the student population, making this a residential campus, with 4,500 students living on campus. Currently there are four housing styles on campus; Greek Court, residence halls, University Court, and University Apartments. The campus consists of seventy buildings on 320 acres of land with an undergraduate student population of over 4,000 men and 5,000 women and 3,000 graduate students. Students involved in student government and the student activities programming board both respectively have organizational meeting space within the student union located on campus. Residence hall council meeting location rotates to the various residence halls.

Definition of Terms

1. Out-of-class experiences are activities and events that are not part of the academic curriculum. They include interactions with faculty out of the classroom, involvement with other students on group projects, purposeful, employment, and involvement in student organizations (Kuh, 1991).
2. Residence Hall learning and living are "environments that maximize the integration of students' cognitive development with the development of the whole personality" (Schroeder, Mable, & Associates, 1994).
3. Student involvement refers to the amount of time and energy students devote to their overall academic experience. This includes but is not limited to membership in student organizations, time spent in class, interactions with faculty members and other students (Astin, 1985).
4. Residence Hall Council is a body of students who are the governing body for each residence hall on the campus of study. Residents apply and run for Residence Hall Council positions, which their peers vote for. Residence Hall Council meets weekly in their respected residence halls. The purpose of the meetings is to review policies for their peers, brainstorm, plan, and organize educational and entertainment activities, organize fund raisers, and other various residential activities.
5. Student Activity Programming board is a organization made up of students who apply and run for positions that offer educational and entertainment programming for the students and university of study. The students meet on a weekly basis to review, plan, problem solve, brainstorm, and organize campus wide programming.
6. Student Government is an organization that serves as a governing body for the university of study. The organization consists of undergraduate and graduate students who apply and are elected by the study body for either senate or cabinet positions. The organizations serve as a liaison for the university administration, Board of Trustees, and academic community. The organization assists in the decision making process for many financial, policy,

and academic decisions for the university. The organization meets weekly and allows for students and employees of the university to attend their meetings and voice their concerns, which then the organization helps to problem solve.

7. Gender identity is an individual's concept of himself or herself as male or female (Ross-Gordon, 1999).

Overview of the Study

This research is organized into five chapters. Chapter I contains the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, hypothesis, significance of the study, limitations, and overview of the study. Chapter II is divided into four sections that review relevant literature and research. The following topics are discussed in the literature review: gender roles, gender leadership theories, student involvement, and demographics. Chapter III describes the research methods and procedures used in the study. Instrumentation, population and sampling procedures, data collection procedures, research design, and data analysis are each included in the third chapter. Chapter IV provides the analysis of data and presentation of the research findings. For the purposes of research and findings the results are categorized into six themes that are present within the online survey. The survey consists of six themes that contribute to leadership. Chapter V summarizes the study with conclusions and recommendations for subsequent research.

Chapter II

Literature Review

Gender Roles

Identifying gender roles can be traced back to the three theories of gender identify development; psychoanalytical theory, social learning theory, and cognitive development models. Each of these theories are founded on ideas that have been presented in research conducted by Gilligan (1982) and Kohlberg (1966). First according to psychoanalytical theory, the fear of retaliation from a male's father creates the separation from their mother. This initially creates gender identity with the father and masculine characteristics. Social learning theory maintains that gender identity is created by gender socialization and imitation of peer interaction. The theory also extends to imitation of television, music, comics, and other sources of media. The third theory, cognitive development model, assumes that an individual's understanding of gender may be different at various ages. The theory also explains that that the development of an individual's gender identity coexists with the ability to reason on other aspects of the world. Kohlberg (1966) proposed many stages of gender development: gender identity, gender stability, and gender constancy. The stages consist of identity through physical characteristics, consistency of gender over time, and that gender is unchanging. Assumptions about appropriate roles, occupations, and traits become associated with gender labels, which create the gender schema theory.

One proposed reason for the sparse number of females in upper level positions is the existence of gender-based stereotypes in the leadership domain. These stereotypes suggest that characteristics associated with formal leadership are more agnetic, which are more closely identified with men and masculine traits than with women and feminine traits (Martell & DeSmet, 2001). Men are associated with agentic traits such as being assertive, controlling, dominant, and confident. Communal characteristics, on the other hand, are ascribed more strongly to women. Communal characteristics include affectionate, kind, and sympathetic (Eagly & Kauau, 2002). In a survey conducted by Bass (1990) 1,161 college students described strong leadership skills that would be identified as masculine rather than feminine

traits on the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Men are expected to possess high levels of agnetic qualities, such as independence, assertiveness, and competence, while women possess communal attributes. Women are expected to be friendly, unselfish, emotionally expressive, and have high concern for others (Eagly & Karau, 1991). These gender role expectations are assumed to develop from the distribution of women and men into different specific social roles in society. Individuals' gender roles develop from their roles in society with women seen as more domestic than men. Traditionally, men are seen as dominant in both society and in business. These role expectations pertain to agnetic and communal qualities reflected in male and female behavior.

Chodorow (1978) attributes the development of gendered personalities for females and males to the fact that mothers are the primary parent. Females tend to identify with their mothers and express emotions of sensitivity, care for others, and thoughtfulness. Males who initially bond with their mothers later have to separate from them and identify with their fathers to develop a masculine identity. The process of changing from mother to father facilitates independence, rationale, and the ability to be objective.

Masculinity and femininity have various sets of stereotypical characteristics associated with them depending on the culture; these characteristics shape gender roles. Gender roles are theories about the characteristics, attributes, and traits of men and women. Gender roles encompass both descriptive and injunctive norms. Descriptive norms are the consensual expectations about what members of a group actually do, and injunctive norms are the expectations about what a group of people should or ought to do (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Within the U.S. men are more associated with agnetic characteristics of leadership than women. A study conducted by Harper (2006) examined the ideas of masculinity of African American undergraduate males at six predominately white institutions. Harper's findings identified a limited number of descriptions of masculinity. The participants in Harper's (2006) study did not include leadership positions, academic honors, or maintaining high profiles on campus as masculine. The participants did define masculinity by achievement through material possessions.

Gender Leadership Theories

Role congruity theory suggests that the perceived incongruity between the female gender role and the traditional concepts of the leadership role results in two types of prejudices. The first is that men are deemed more favorable than women as potential leaders. This prejudice stems from descriptive norms of gender roles, which state that leadership ability is more stereotypical of men than of women. The second form of prejudice is that social perceivers who endorse traditional gender roles evaluate the behavior used to carry out a leadership role less favorable when it is done by a woman than when it is enacted by a man (Eagly & Karau, 2002). According to injunctive norms, leadership behavior is not consistent with the way women ought to act, so it is less desirable in women than it is in men. Men are more often perceived as leaders, more likely to enact behaviors traditionally associated with leadership, and to emerge as leaders more often than women. This is because people more readily accept agnetic behavior from men than from women. Role congruity theory suggests that it is more difficult for women to attain and succeed in leadership positions than it is for men.

Once women overcome the obstacles to attaining leadership positions, they are faced with threats from two directions when in a leadership role. Female leaders can conform to their gender role and act feminine, which fails to meet the requirements of their leadership role, or they can conform to their leadership role and act more masculine, which fails to meet their gender role requirements (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Women placed in this difficult situation are pressured to find the most appropriate leadership style; one that balances the communal traits required by their traditional gender role and the agnetic traits associated with their leadership positions. According to gender role analysis of group behavior in the study by Eagly & Karau (1991) "men should engage in proportionally more task activity and women in proportionally more social activity" (p. 686). Eagly & Karau's study also indicated that men have a higher rate of task contribution than women, and women had a higher rate of social contribution. Their observations were consistent with the generalization that men exude more agnetic behaviors and women exude more communal behaviors.

The group value model suggests that the leadership style used by the leader communicates important information about the relationships within the group (Bass, 1981). In contrast to autocratic leaders, democratic leaders convey to their group members that their input is important and valued. Female leaders are thought to be more attentive to upward communication from their followers, while male leaders are expected to be more focused on downward communication and directiveness (Bass, 1981). This tendency for women leaders to take into consideration information from their group members is consistent with democratic leadership. Directiveness and delegation that male leaders tend to use are characteristic of autocratic leadership. This greater tendency for women to adopt a democratic style of leadership than for men to use an autocratic style relates to gender role stereotypes (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

If a female leader takes on a passive, participatory style of leadership, she is criticized for being too passive, conversely she adopts an autocratic, task-oriented style, she is seen as too aggressive and too masculine (Bass, 1981). Men, however, are freer to lead in an autocratic and non-participative manner if they desire because they are not constrained by followers' attitudinal bias about biological sex and leadership (Eagly, Makhikani, & Klonsky, 1992). Women who fill leadership positions are required to make adjustments that their male counterparts are not required to make (Bass, 1990).

Societal gender roles that make it more difficult for a woman than a man to attain leadership positions are evident in schools. Studies have shown a need for an environment that promotes leadership development, opportunities for women to develop their skills, and continual environment assessment (Whitt, 1994). It is also consistent with gender role theory to argue that if positive social behaviors become important to a group's success, women might emerge as leaders more often due to their greater attention to group morale and positive interpersonal relations (Eagly & Karau, 1991).

Research has supported the theory that it is not beneficial or successful to treat male and female students as if they have identical needs (Whitt, 1994). Promoting similarity for use of dominant social norms more often benefits males instead of

creating equality (Whitt, 1994). A null environment for either sex can cause an equal amount of damage as discouragement (Forest, Hotelling, & Kuk, 1984). Research also suggests that as students see leaders of their gender they are more able to identify leadership characteristics associated with their gender.

Within higher education the learning environment's status quo doesn't provide for maximum leadership development. "Support was found for masculine and androgynous individuals emerging as leaders with greater frequency than feminine or undifferentiated individuals" (Kolb, 1997, p. 375). It could be argued that past socialization, away from government and leadership interests, and toward more feminine interests like nurturing and caring types of activities could contribute to a lack of female political participation. It is possible that university women are involved in other student activities than governance that better reflect their interests (Miller & Kraus, 2005). A 2004 study, conducted by Miller and Kraus, explored whether women were equally represented in leadership roles in college student governance at twenty-one Midwestern universities. The authors surveyed college student governments and asked them to report how many women participated in governance. Analyses showed that, while women were elected as representatives to student government, "they were under-represented in presidential or vice-presidential positions" (Miller & Kraus, 2005, p. 444). The authors considered structural factors, such as female faculty advisors, which were correlated with a greater likelihood of having a female student government leader. "Simple analyses showed that while women held nearly half (a mean of 47.9%) of the student government positions, the majority of student government leaders were male" (Miller & Kraus, 2005, p. 425). Fifteen of the twenty-one student government presidents were male, while an additional fifteen of the twenty-one vice presidents were male. "It is true that students are more likely to participate in student activities that are related to their academic major or future career plans" (McCannon & Bennett, 2001, p. 315). Having strong academic programs in which women are most likely to major might decrease the number of women participating in campus government. Often academic programs have other student organizations in which women get involved.

Loden (1985) maintained that there is a masculine mode of organizational management, representing qualities such as competitiveness, hierarchical authority, control as a leader, and analytic problem solving. These qualities are often associated with individuals displaying emotion. Loden argued that women displayed much more emotion when in leadership positions. Women are also more problem solvers and display rationale when making decisions. Henning and Jardin (1977) also acknowledged sex-differentiated managerial characteristics. They ascribed these characteristics to personal traits that are formed through socialization from the Oedipus complex. Kanter (1977) also argued that apparent sex differences in organizational leadership are a product of structural differences. Men are perceived to be more self-assertive and motivated to master their environment. They are also more aggressive, independent, and forceful. In contrast, women are seen to be more selfless and concerned with others. (Eagley & Johnson, 1990) Research on gender on these two orientations have been labeled masculine and feminine. Although the task and interpersonal dimensions studied in leadership research are not as broad as the general tendencies examined in gender stereotype, it provides an excellent opportunity to determine where the behavior of leaders is gender stereotypical. Men are often described as independent, competitive, and interpersonally insensitive (Biernat, 1991).

Distinction between task and interpersonal styles was first identified in leadership research by Bales (1950). Bales proposed two categories of leaders; those with an orientation to task accomplishment and those with a concern of morale and relationships with group members. "Task and interpersonal styles in leadership research are obviously relevant to gender because of the stereotypes people have about gender differences in these aspects of behavior" (Eagly & Johnson, 1990, p. 236). In a study conducted by Eagly & Johnson (1990), 125 female and 181 male students completed three surveys that were each an hour in length. Each of the questionnaires contained brief descriptions of each of the 119 leadership roles investigated in the organizational studies. For one of the questionnaires, respondents judged the roles in response to two questions eliciting self-reports of their competence and interest in relation to each role. Leadership styles were slightly gender

stereotypic; the weighted mean computed across all types of style was slightly, but significantly stereotypic. "We have established that leadership style findings generated in experimental settings tend to be gender stereotypic" (Eagly & Johnson, 1990, p. 249). Women's leadership styles were more democratic than men's even in organizational settings. This gender difference may reflect "underlying differences in female and male personality" or skills and/or subtle differences in the status of women and men who occupy the same organizational role (Eagly & Johnson, 1990, p. 249).

Research on Student Involvement

The Carnegie Commission suggests that student officers in campus organizations develop leadership skills (Miller-Bernal, 1993). Keohane (1984) states that nothing prepares for "leadership like the experience of leading" (p. 24). Previous research by Astin, (1991) suggests that leadership experience helps develop a sense of competence and self confidence. Astin and Kent (1983) also suggest that women who hold leadership positions in college develop a greater level of self-esteem and leadership self-efficacy than uninvolved women. Previous research illustrates that student leadership is crucial to the development of self-esteem, confidence, and leadership self-efficacy.

Hernandez, Hogan, Hathaway, and Lovell (1999) described student involvement as "athletics, Greek organizations, general activities, organizations, on-campus living, out-of-class involvement with faculty, peer interaction, and employment"(p. 141). Kuh and Lund (1994) also noted the growth of students citing that "learning and personal development are enhanced when students are more actively engaged in educationally purposeful out-of-class activities" (p. 6). It is important to recognize the outcomes students attribute to involvement in college. Many studies show that students' involvement will be more likely to have a positive impact on their academic development, general knowledge, and analytical and critical thinking skills than a student who is not involved in co-curricular activities. Kuh and Lund (1994) observed that "more than seventy percent of what students learn during college was attributed to out-of-class experiences" (p. 8). Those out-of-the class

experiences can range from social clubs, marching band, writing for the university newspaper, or even collaborating on a research project. Astin (1984) concluded, based on a number of studies of student involvement, that "the greater the students' involvement in college, the greater will be the amount of student learning and personal development" (p. 528).

The 1984 National Institute of Education report Involvement in Learning suggested that students who are more involved in activities related to their formal education "will grow more as individuals, will be more satisfied with their education, will persist in their education to graduation, and will continue their learning after college" (Willford, 1997, p. 128). Involvement is strongly related to the undergraduate educational experience and retention of students. Astin's (1984) theory of involvement supports that student learning increases as their involvement in both the academic and social aspects of the collegiate experience increases. Students who are involved devote significant energy to academics, spend more time on campus, participate actively in student organizations and activities, and interact often with faculty. On the other hand, uninvolved students neglect their studies, spend little time on campus, abstain from extracurricular activities, and rarely initiate contact with faculty or other students (Astin, 1984). Importantly, the most persuasive types of involvement are "academic involvement, involvement with faculty, and involvement with student peer groups" (Astin, 1996, p. 126). According to Astin (1984), the quality and quantity of the student's involvement influences several educational outcomes including cognitive learning, satisfaction with the entire college experience, and increased rates of student retention (Astin, 1984, 1999). "Extensive research confirms the positive relationships of non-cognitive variables such as college student out-of-classroom involvement with academic achievement, student satisfaction, self-concept, and academic persistence" (Hoffman, 2002, p. 17). Literature supports the belief that student involvement 'in purposeful out-of-class activities is positively related to social and cognitive development" (Emerick & Sandra, 2004, p. 1162)

Previous research supports the theory that those students who live on campus, rather than those students who commute, will maximize opportunities for social, cultural, and co-curricular involvement. Blimling supported this previous research by

concluding that, "residential living creates a social-psychological environment for students that is qualitatively different from that experienced by those who live at home or elsewhere off campus" (1993). A number of researchers ranging from Chickering, Pascarella, Welty, Billson and Terry, have concluded that students who live on campus have higher levels of satisfaction from their college experience. Schroeder, Mable and Associates summarized the findings of these researchers "compared to their counterparts who live at home and commute to college, resident students have significantly more social interaction with peers and faculty and are significantly more likely to be involved in co-curricular activities and to use campus facilities" (p. 26). Residents are significantly more satisfied with college and are more positive about their social and interpersonal environment of their campus than the commuting students. Research overwhelming supports the importance of social integration during college as a significant determinant of persistence and graduation. Many studies have evaluated the various factors of graduation determinants. Schroeder, Mable and Associates (1994) found in several studies that even when controls are applied to students' graduation factors, such as previous academic performance, aptitude, socioeconomic status, students who live in residence halls consistently graduate at significantly higher rates than students who have not had the on campus living experience. A 1977 study by Astin, found that on average students who live in residence halls gain a twelve percent net advantage to students' chance of persisting in college and graduating.

Studies have also revealed that students living on campus report higher levels of self-esteem, intellectual orientation, academic and social self-concepts, and greater growth in ego development. Greater gains in autonomy and inner-directedness were also found. (Sullivan and Sullivan, 1980) In regards to values, attitudes, and moral judgment, the strongest evidence is in the areas of aesthetic, cultural, and intellectual values and social and political liberalism. Those students who live in campus residence halls display higher gains even when controls are placed on previous influences.

A study conducted by Chee, Pino, and Smith (2005) at Georgia Southern University of 675 students identified gender differences among females and males

and their academic achievement. Their survey received a 94% return rate and included 277 males and 382 females, who represented all undergraduate academic classifications. In their study the authors identified the relationship between gender roles and academic ethic and achievement by referring to Coleman's (1988) concept of social capitol and Gilligan's (1982) theory of women's' development. The authors' survey included twenty questions that contained a variety of questions ranging from time spent on academics, social and work activities, study habits, and decision making processes. Those results revealed that social capitol takes the form in obligations and/or expectations of social norms, which influence their attitudes and behaviors. The social relationships between group members forces individuals to follow group expectations. Students' academic achievement and development may result from their social relationships. The authors proposed that both females and males academic achievement is determined by their social capitol. The social capitol revealed differences in the likelihood of volunteering, interaction with faculty, and higher grade point averages. Certain groups valued academic ethic more so than others. The survey revealed that females learned the academic ethic more quickly than males from their affiliations. The results also displayed higher likelihood for females to volunteers than males and also females were more likely to have relationships with faculty. It was also identified that females had higher grade point averages than the males. For the females active participation in student clubs and organizations was positively related to higher grade point averages. For the males, employment was associated with lower grade point averages.

Hu and Kuh (2002) conducted a study that presented results to suggest females and males engage in different types of student organizations. Their results indicated that males are more likely to either disengage or highly engage in constructive educational activities and females are more likely to engage in typical groups. Gender highly influences what type of student group students will join. Females join groups that have a higher level of academic effort, while males join organizations that are more sports and exercise concentrated.

Male Student Involvement

Two theories that help explain the lack of the male engagement trend are socialization and entitlement. The socialization theory tells us that it is not "cool" or masculine to succeed academically, while the entitlement theory suggests that because white men have succeeded, for example "earning higher salaries, more often than men of color and women of all races, they have been subtly taught that it will just happen for them, without having to work for it" (Barone & Linder, 2001, p. 123).

Becoming involved on campus is not a priority or seen as a necessity by many male students. Harper (2005) article described the contrast of alternative expressions of manliness, such as doing well in school or "participating in non-sports related school activities, must be approved by other male peer group members" (p. 91). Harper also observed that males who are class presidents are perceived to be as manly as the males who are athletic. In regards to expectations of society; he writes, "society has historically suggested that boys should play sports, suppress outward displays of emotion, and compete rigorously against each other" (p.92).

Studies indicate that men and women utilize different moral orientations and leadership styles in their various leadership roles (Desjardins 2002). Looking at leadership styles further complicates matters. Gender-role expectations suggest that masculine leaders are autonomous, organized, task-oriented, controlling, unemotional, directive, assertive, autocratic, dominating, or independent (Eagly, 1992). Feminine leaders, on the other hand, are mediating, facilitating, less efficient, less action-oriented, understanding, helpful, warm, democratic, unselfish, collaborative, interpersonally oriented, concerned with others, or emotionally expressive (Eagly, 1992).

"Lack of curricular and co-curricular engagement of college men negatively influences their graduation rates and speed of degree attainment" (Kuh, 2005, p. 90). College professionals need to engage college men to help them graduate, and professionals need to provide a safe climate for women on college campuses, both physically and mentally. If men are not engaged on campuses, professionals must ask the question, are we engaging enough (Barone & Linder, 2007)? Two theories, socialization and entitlement, help explain the level of involvement of male college

students in community based organizations, service organizations, and academic organizations. College men underutilize all campus resources with the exception of campus recreation centers (Clayton, 2004), adversely affecting their college experiences (Astin, 1977).

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy, is a person's "judgments of capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances" (Murphy, 2002, p. 9). High self-efficacy has been shown to lead to improved performance in a number of domains and situations. Heightened self-efficacy is also related to increased motivation. Self-efficacy is a good indicator of group and organizational performance (Chemers, 2002). Increased self-efficacy for leadership should increase a leader's ability to succeed under stressful circumstances. Researchers also suggest that leadership efficacy refers to ones' belief in his or her ability to lead and his or her leadership effectiveness (Hoyt, Murphy, Halverson, & Watson, 2003). Literature supports the idea that self-efficacy influences what people choose to do, suggesting that leaders with high levels of self-efficacy will be more likely to seek out future leadership roles, than people with low levels of self-efficacy, especially in that leadership domain (Bandura, 1982). High levels of self-efficacy increase the probability that a student will not only hold leadership positions in the future, but also be a more successful leader. There are three critical functions of effective leadership: image management, relationship development, and resource deployment (Chemers, 2002).

Demographics

According to the U.S. Department of Education (2004), enrollment in degree granting institutions increased by 17% between 1984 and 1999. The increased rate rose at a higher rate from 1994 to 2004 of a 21% increase. Female enrollment raised by 25% from 1994-2004, while male enrollment only increased by 16%. Between 1990 and 2004, the enrollment of students under the age of 25 rose by 31%. The enrollment of persons 25 and over increased by 17% in that same time period.

Projections from the U.S. Department of Education indicate that the trend toward more women in higher education will continue (Hussar, 2005). Student affairs professionals must be educated on the increasing rhetoric about the "gender gap," and be willing to try new programmatic initiatives to engage college students. When discussing the changing gender demographics of higher education, it is important to note that the "implications of the gender gap are potentially positive for higher education and society as a whole" (Barone & Linder, 2006, p. 128) "With proportionally more women enrolling and graduating in higher education, one outcome may be an overall decrease in the wage gap" (Barone & Linder, 2006, p. 141).

Summary

It is imperative that women have access to female leadership positions to increase their intent to lead in the future and better the numbers of formal leadership positions in society held by women. The data suggests that leadership experience likely leads to greater self-efficacy, domain identification, and intent to lead in the future. Individuals with leadership experience will more likely feel confident leading, be interested in fulfilling a leadership role, and seek out leadership positions in the future. This also holds true for male students. Current research is delving into male student leadership, fearing that men will continue to fall solely into society's gender role, rather than developing as an individual. The above research highlights the different theories and characteristics of leadership that can assist professionals in their advisement of student leadership development. The research supports the ideas of adapting to the different male and female needs of student leaders and that their developmental processes can have similarities and differences. Males and females require guidance in their identity development and further support in the challenge of identifying their leadership style.

Gender roles provide challenges for college students. They are not only working through their vectors and individual development, they are also attempting to identify their individual characteristics that make them stand out or become a part of their new environment.

The essence of any truly successful leader is the ability to use a variety of leadership styles based on the requirements of the situation (Symphony Orchestra Institute, 1998).

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Survey Methodology

The focus of this study was to compare leadership characteristics by gender of students who are involved in one or more of three campus organizations; residence hall council, student activities programming board, or student government. A survey was administered to determine if there were any differences or similarities of leadership characteristics between male and female undergraduate students at a Midwestern mid-size public university. The leadership characteristic survey instrument was developed by Emrick (2005) for a research thesis as part of a multi survey research project. The current study adapted Emrick's (2005) survey to fit an updated Likert-scale and the researcher's three research questions. The goal of the instrument was to provide more knowledge in the areas of female and male leadership characteristics, do females and males possess different or similar leadership characteristics, do their leadership characteristics differ statistically, and what type of leadership do females and males engage in.

Participants

One hundred and thirty students from one mid-sized Midwestern university were eligible to participate in this study. Undergraduate college students aged 18-23 were chosen as the target population of this study because this age represents a period of moral and cognitive development. Piaget determined that morality can be considered a developmental process. Educators have taken many approaches to education due to Piaget's theories. Part of his theory was that schools should emphasize cooperative decision-making and problem solving, nurturing moral development by requiring students to work out common rules based on fairness. Kohlberg recognized three levels of moral development which encompassed six stages. Each level represented a shift in the social-moral perspective of the individual According to Berkowitz and Grynch (1998) there are four psychological foundations of moral development; "self control, social orientation, compliance with external

standards, and self esteem." Dr. Berkowitz explains that these four foundations form the moral development of an individual. Social orientation is developed at high levels if a child is raised in a loving environment.

The target population was comprised of students who are involved in campus residence hall councils, student activity programming board, or student government association. These students represented an equal opportunity for all genders to become involved. The students also serve as leaders for a large amount of the student population. Students who comprised the residence hall councils represent forty percent of the institution's 2007-2008 academic year enrollment, since forty percent of the institution's students reside on campus during the academic year. The students who comprised student activities programming board and student government allocate a large percentage of student fee funds, which greatly affect the institution's environment.

Recruitment for participation of the study was done by various actions of the researcher. Permission was first received by the institution's Internal Review Board. Once the researcher received permission for the study she contacted the offices of Residence Living and Student Life. Professionals within those offices provided the researcher with contact information for the three organizations. The professionals were also asked if the researcher could attend each of the three organizational meetings. The researcher attended meetings for student activities programming board, student government, and residence hall association. The researcher was unable to attend each residence hall council meeting for the various residence halls, therefore by attending the residence hall association meeting the researcher could distribute marketing materials for each residence hall council delegate in attendance at the meeting. At each of the meetings the researcher introduced herself and gave an explanation of the study. The researcher explained that each of the students involved in the organizations would receive an email in their institution email accounts directly from the researcher. The email would contain the study's purpose and electronic link for the online survey. It was also explained to the students that they would be completing the survey on a voluntary basis and would be able to terminate their

survey at any time. Students in attendance were able to ask questions of the researcher.

Immediately following each of the organizational meetings, which consequently were held on three consecutive evenings of the same week, the survey was distributed by institution email accounts. The researcher also encouraged the support of graduate assistant advisors and professional staff advisors to prompt students to participate in the study. After two weeks of the survey being open online a second email was sent to all eligible participants to encourage their participation. Students were also encouraged to complete the survey for the chance to win a gift card.

Of the one hundred and thirty students eligible to participate in the study one hundred and eleven visited the online survey site. Of those one hundred and eleven visits one hundred and five students partially completed the survey. After three weeks the survey was closed and had a sixty-five percent rate of eighty-four entirely completed surveys.

Measures

Students received the email that contained an electronic link to the online survey created on Zoomerang (Emrick, 2005). Survey questions from Emrick's 2005 survey as well as the researchers own questions were used to create the survey questions. Students were asked what characteristics they feel they have as a leader and which skills do they prefer to use as a leader. The responses to each survey were anonymous, only the demographic questions corresponded to the response regarding leadership skills and characteristics. The online survey consisted of forty questions, which contained six underlying themes of leadership (Appendix C). The forty survey questions were formatted for a Likert-type scale. Participation was entirely voluntary and the students were able to terminate the survey at any time. The students were given an incentive of a chance to win a gift card to complete the survey.

Due to the survey instrument being utilized from another researcher's thesis, the instrument's validity and reliability have not been tested and therefore create two limitations of the present study. Also a delimitation of the present study is the absence

of ethnicity from the demographic information. Participants were not asked their ethnicity and therefore that variable could not be tested. Further research should include ethnicity into the demographics and use survey instruments with tested validity and reliability.

Demographic

The student demographics were broken into various categories; gender, age bracket, martial status, academic classification, number of institutions attended, academic year residence, grade point average bracket, academic major, parents' educational level, and number of credit hours currently enrolled in. For the use of the study only the eighty-four fully completed surveys were used and therefore only the demographics from those eighty-four surveys were included in the study. Of the eighty-four surveys, the following demographics defined the data set as discussed below; 32 male, 52 female, 0 transgender. Appendix B includes a full detailed list of the eleven demographic questions and responses.

Procedure

Students involved in either on campus residence hall council, student government, or student activity programming board were sent the survey via email, through a distribution list provided by the residence living and student life staff. The survey was emailed to all students containing an electronic link to the online survey website, which was part of the online Zoomerang website. The forty question online survey was available for three weeks. The survey was then closed and analysis of the data began. The online survey system exported the information into an excel file. The excel file allowed the researcher to transfer the data into a research software program; Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for the purpose of the thesis. After the surveys were completed the researcher thoroughly organized the survey responses, tabulated the results, and exported them into an SPSS spreadsheet, so that there was the ability for the researcher to compare and contrast the responses. The researcher analyzed the characteristics that were described by the female and male students. For the purpose of the study and organization the researcher categorized the

survey responses into six underlying categories of leadership characteristics; support, authority, collaboration, nurture, sense of achievement, and responsibility.

For the data analysis the researcher first identified the validity of the data and also the alpha coefficient to designate which results would be considered significantly different. One way ANOVA tests were conducted for each leadership theme with one variable, being gender. Following the execution of those tests the researcher conducted one way ANOVA tests for the forty question survey with five variables. Tests were only conducted with one variable present at a time. The five variables tested were gender, grade point average, age, academic class, and academic year residence.

Summary

Chapter III detailed the research methodology for the present study. Chapter IV will address the three research questions presented in Chapter I with additional information provided by the supplementary tests conducted by the researcher for further information. The research questions and their corresponding demographic questions will be reviewed in Chapter IV. The data within Chapter IV captures the similarities and differences among the female and male participants. The six categories will provide themes within the results. Chapter V presents the findings for the present study, and suggestions for student affairs practitioners and future researchers.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS/FINDINGS

Participants for the present study consisted of eighty-four undergraduate student leaders involved in either residence hall council, student activities programming board, or student government. From the eighty-four student participants thirty-two identified as male, fifty-two identified as female, and none identified as transgender. The gender percentages were thirty-eight percent male and sixty-two percent female. A majority of the student participants identified their age as twenty to twenty-one years of age at fifty-two percent of the participants and twenty-five percent of the participants.

The themes presented within this chapter emerged from the forty question survey that was distributed to the student participants (Emerick, 2005). The specific questions from the online survey contained six underlying themes of leadership characteristics or skills. To ensure a thorough and accurate report of the findings of the study, the themes are categorized by their skill or characteristics: support, authority, collaboration, nurture, achievement, and responsibility. This chapter is a detailed account of the statistical analysis. Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the internal consistency reliability coefficient for the forty question survey and resulted in 0.775, with a 98.8%.

For the purpose of this research the descriptive variables of the leadership themes of support, collaboration, achievement, authority, nurture, and responsibility were used to contrast responses. It was important to conduct one way ANOVA tests for each leadership theme that was present in the study. One way ANOVA is a collection of statistical models and their associated procedures in which the observed variance is partitioned into components due to different explanatory variables. ANOVA tests allowed the researcher to identify a vast amount of statistical information in an accessible manner. Gender was used as the variable for each of the six underlying leadership themes for the sole purpose of the research questions.

Support

The leadership theme of support categorized seven of the forty survey question items. Those items were questions 1, 5, 8, 11 25, 31, and 35. These questions ranged from statements of providing trust to fellow group members, displaying confidence, providing rewards, showing friendliness friendliness, and showing concern for the other group members. Of those seven survey questions none of the question responses had a significant difference of 0.05 or less. Their coefficients ranged from 0.209-0.959 as seen in Table 1.

Table 1

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Confidence	Between Groups	.132	1	.132	.134	.715
	Within Groups	81.106	82	.989		
	Total	81.238	83			
friendly	Between Groups	.202	1	.202	.450	.504
	Within Groups	36.798	82	.449		
	Total	37.000	83			
showconcern	Between Groups	1.704	1	1.704	1.604	.209
	Within Groups	87.106	82	1.062		
	Total	88.810	83			
suggestions	Between Groups	.454	1	.454	1.111	.295
	Within Groups	33.546	82	.409		
	Total	34.000	83			
behavepredictable	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.003	.959
	Within Groups	88.700	82	1.082		
	Total	88.702	83			
trust	Between Groups	1.077	1	1.077	.940	.335
	Within Groups	93.911	82	1.145		
	Total	94.988	83			
rewards	Between Groups	.310	1	.310	.182	.671
	Within Groups	139.500	82	1.701		
	Total	139.810	83			

Collaboration

Ten survey questions were categorized under collaboration. Those items were questions; 2, 4, 10, 12, 16, 26, 30, 32, 37, and 39. The theme of the collaboration questions were centered on constructively using group ideas, clarifying roles, facilitating positive relationships, collaborating on decisions, and making productive

suggestions. One question, 16, was found to be significant. Question 16 asked participants to agree or disagree with the statement: "organizational goals are dictated". Males significantly replied more in the affirmative to this statement. This question had an alpha coefficient of 0.021 with the variable being gender as seen in Table 2.

Table 2

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Memberideas	Between Groups	.061	1	.061	.070	.792
	Within Groups	70.642	82	.861		
	Total	70.702	83			
clarifyrole	Between Groups	2.407	1	2.407	2.758	.101
	Within Groups	71.546	82	.873		
	Total	73.952	83			
helpgetalong	Between Groups	.847	1	.847	.892	.348
	Within Groups	77.856	82	.949		
	Total	78.702	83			
decisions	Between Groups	.499	1	.499	.533	.467
	Within Groups	76.644	82	.935		
	Total	77.143	83			
goalsdictated	Between Groups	10.029	1	10.029	5.560	.021
	Within Groups	147.923	82	1.804		
	Total	157.952	83			
comfortabletasks	Between Groups	.264	1	.264	.432	.513
	Within Groups	50.058	82	.610		
	Total	50.321	83			
respondfavorably	Between Groups	.454	1	.454	.508	.478
	Within Groups	73.296	82	.894		
	Total	73.750	83			
communicategroup	Between Groups	.372	1	.372	.727	.396
	Within Groups	41.950	82	.512		
	Total	42.321	83			
flexibility	Between Groups	.334	1	.334	.404	.527
	Within Groups	67.702	82	.826		
	Total	68.036	83			
perspective	Between Groups	1.964	1	1.964	2.652	.107
	Within Groups	60.738	82	.741		
	Total	62.702	83			

Achievement

The leadership theme of achievement included five survey questions of those five items one question was found to be significant, which was question 38. The questions contained statements that asked participants to agree or disagree with statements on organizational goals, performance standards, and group responsibility. Question 38 asked participants to agree or disagree with the statement: "I provide a plan for how the work is to be done". The females had much higher frequency of responding with the option of "strongly agree", than the male participants. With the variable of gender an alpha coefficient of 0.041 was the product as seen in Table 3.

Table 3

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
standards	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.983
	Within Groups	81.952	82	.999		
	Total	81.952	83			
ideasconstructively	Between Groups	.264	1	.264	.457	.501
	Within Groups	47.308	82	.577		
	Total	47.571	83			
establishgoals	Between Groups	.714	1	.714	.888	.349
	Within Groups	65.988	82	.805		
	Total	66.702	83			
planaction	Between Groups	3.154	1	3.154	2.405	.125
	Within Groups	107.548	82	1.312		
	Total	110.702	83			
planwork	Between Groups	6.648	1	6.648	4.296	.041
	Within Groups	126.911	82	1.548		
	Total	133.560	83			

Authority

The category of authority contained one survey question to be significant with the variable of gender. The leadership theme of authority contained nine survey questions which ranged from statements of using threats, punishment, and resistance. Question 18 asked participants to agree or disagree with the statement: "I use punishment in my leadership style" which is characteristic of autocratic leadership,

which is identified as a male leadership trait by many researchers. A result of the one way ANOVA tests revealed 0.015 significance, as seen in Table 4.

Table 4

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
fear	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	148.000	82	1.805		
	Total	148.000	83			
threats	Between Groups	3.792	1	3.792	2.578	.112
	Within Groups	120.625	82	1.471		
	Total	124.417	83			
groupsresp	Between Groups	.969	1	.969	1.805	.183
	Within Groups	44.019	82	.537		
	Total	44.988	83			
punishment	Between Groups	9.298	1	9.298	6.199	.015
	Within Groups	122.988	82	1.500		
	Total	132.286	83			
reviewfunctions	Between Groups	.264	1	.264	.082	.776
	Within Groups	265.308	82	3.235		
	Total	265.571	83			
resistance	Between Groups	.359	1	.359	.179	.673
	Within Groups	164.308	82	2.004		
	Total	164.667	83			
littleconfidence	Between Groups	.372	1	.372	.339	.562
	Within Groups	89.950	82	1.097		
	Total	90.321	83			
tellmembers	Between Groups	6.055	1	6.055	2.871	.094
	Within Groups	172.933	82	2.109		
	Total	178.988	83			
definerole	Between Groups	2.610	1	2.610	1.406	.239
	Within Groups	152.200	82	1.856		
	Total	154.810	83			

Nurture

The leadership theme of nurture contained six survey questions with 50% of those questions returning statistically significant responses between the variable of male versus female. Nurture was an important leadership theme to have present due to literature presented in Chapter II. The questions categorized under nurture presented statements on using evaluations, treating peers fairly, disclosing thoughts and feelings, showing encouragement, assisting members to feeling comfortable within the group, and helping members with problems. Questions 19, 24, and 40

resulted in significant differences of 0.022, 0.043, and 0.020. Question 19 asked participants to agree or disagree with the statement: "I know the problems faced by group members"; question 24: "evaluations of group members are used; and question 40: "I disclose thoughts and feelings to group members". Data from this theme can be reviewed in Table 5.

Table 5

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
encourage	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.001	.976
	Within Groups	41.952	82	.512		
	Total	41.952	83			
comfortable	Between Groups	.066	1	.066	.083	.773
	Within Groups	64.827	82	.791		
	Total	64.893	83			
knowproblems	Between Groups	6.984	1	6.984	5.417	.022
	Within Groups	105.719	82	1.289		
	Total	112.702	83			
evaluations	Between Groups	11.358	1	11.358	4.226	.043
	Within Groups	220.392	82	2.688		
	Total	231.750	83			
treatfairly	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.005	.944
	Within Groups	46.700	82	.570		
	Total	46.702	83			
disclosethoughts	Between Groups	8.657	1	8.657	5.665	.020
	Within Groups	125.296	82	1.528		
	Total	133.952	83			

Responsibility

The final theme within the forty question survey contained three questions. These questions presented statements of making decisions, providing criteria to group members, and dictating group goals. Question 23 returned a statistical significance of 0.021 which can be reviewed in Table 6.

Table 6

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
makedecisions	Between Groups	1.704	1	1.704	.999	.321
	Within Groups	139.856	82	1.706		
	Total	141.560	83			
criteria	Between Groups	8.160	1	8.160	5.569	.021
	Within Groups	120.161	82	1.465		
	Total	128.321	83			
dictategoals	Between Groups	8.469	1	8.469	3.237	.076
	Within Groups	214.519	82	2.616		
	Total	222.988	83			

The researcher also conducted one way ANOVA tests using five other variables that were not directly specific to the research questions; however these five variables should be used for further use and discussion. Those five variables were used for all forty survey questions and did not dissect the forty questions into the leadership themes. The research used gender, grade point average, age, academic class, and residence during the academic year. The researcher found three of those specified variables to return significant differences, gender, grade point average, and age. The variables of academic class and residence during the academic year did not return any significant differences. While these variables are not under the umbrella of the research questions they are important factors to consider when implementing leadership training for undergraduate students and will be discussed in Chapter V.

Gender

By using the variable of gender (male versus female), mean responses to forty survey questions were statistically significant at an alpha coefficient of 0.05 or less. These statistically significant questions were categorized under the underlying leadership themes of collaboration, authority, nurture, achievement, and responsibility. Three of the statistically significant questions were questions that were categorized as the leadership characteristics and/or skill of nurture.

These questions that were statistically significant concerned the following questions: survey question 16 (organizational goals are dictated), survey question

eighteen "I use punishment in my leadership style", survey question nineteen "I know the problems faced by group members", survey question twenty-three "I provide criteria for what is expected of the group", survey question twenty-four "evaluations of group members are used" survey question thirty-eight "I provide a plan for how the work is to be done" and survey question forty "I disclose thoughts and feelings to group members". Moreover question eighteen had the highest statistically significance at 0.015. The other questions ranged from a significance of 0.043 to 0.020.

Grade Point Average

Using the variable of grade point average (GPA) the researcher revealed similar results from the variable of gender. Seven survey question items were found to have statistically significant alpha coefficient differences of 0.05 or less. The seven statistically significant questions were categorized as questions under the following underlying leadership characteristics and/or skills themes: collaboration, authority, nurture, achievement, and responsibility. These seven survey questions were identified: survey question 16 "organizational goals are dictated", survey question eighteen "I use punishment in my leadership style", survey question nineteen "I know the problems faced by group members", survey question twenty-three "I provide criteria for what is expected of the group), survey question twenty-four (evaluations of group members are used" survey question thirty-eight "I provide a plan for how the work is to be done" and survey question forty "I disclose thoughts and feelings to group members". Each of these questions, that returned a significant difference, were questions that had a higher frequency of participants with higher GPA's select "strongly agree" or "agree" than participants with lower GPA's. These seven survey questions were the exact same survey questions that were found statistically significant under the variable of gender. Once again question eighteen had the highest statistically significance alpha coefficient of 0.015.

Age

The third variable used for the one way ANOVA tests was age. Under this variable four survey questions were identified to have statistical significance. These statistically significant questions were categorized as: questions under the following underlying leadership characteristics and/or skills themes: collaboration, nurture, achievement, and support. These four survey question were identified as; survey question 12 "decisions are made as group", survey question fifteen "group members' ideas are used constructively", and survey question twenty-five (I show concern for the personal well being of others). Survey question twelve had the highest statistical significance with an alpha coefficient of 0.018. The remaining two survey questions had an alpha coefficient range of 0.047 to 0.042.

Data collection of these three variables can be seen in Appendix E. This appendix contains the tables that further describe the data and its significance for further research of this topic.

Summary

The statistical data returned from the one way ANOVA tests collected for the purpose of this research presented a variety of points of significance. Differences between the genders of female and male were present in five of the six leadership themes. While certain themes contained more questions that returned higher significance, each theme represents prior research and theory of the differences and similarities between leadership styles of females and males.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The present study was conducted to explore the similarities and differences among undergraduate female and male student leaders within their leadership characteristics. The catalyst for the study was a result of the researcher's observations and conversations with various higher educational professionals. The present study allowed the researcher to have a stronger knowledge base of undergraduate female and male student leadership. One limitation of the study was the small number of students who were able to participate in the study, due to the narrow field created by the researcher.

Countless researchers have supported Astin's (1984) theory that active involvement of both inside and outside the classroom positively affects a wide range of student outcomes, including cognitive and intellectual skill development (Kuh, 1995), college adjustment (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1981), moral and ethical development (Liddell & Davis, 1996), and psychological development and positive images of self (Bandura, 1983). The skills acquired that are associated with student engagement have been researched and published by many well respected researchers. Kuh (1995) explains that the research is unequivocal: students who are actively engaged or involved in outside of the classroom activities gain more from their college experience than students who are not involved. This knowledge and insight into student engagement encourages researchers to delve deeper into student engagement, therefore having a better knowledge base of engagement related gains and student involvement.

Gender organizational dominance between females and males has created an expectation to demonstrate attitudes, behaviors, and traits that benefit their specific gender (Bohan 1997). Unger (1990) further describes the expectations for specific genders, which include being non feminine for males, being a breadwinner, and agnetic. Females have high expectations to display expressive emotions, a strong interest in others, and responsibility for children. Some theorists have hypothesized that the normative beliefs dictate the masculinity form of males and an ideological

belief system that is part of the larger system of gender relations. Masculinity Ideology (MI) focuses on beliefs that men should and should not perform certain behaviors.

Gilligan (1993) suggests that identity development among males is primarily characterized by autonomy, achievement concerns, mastery, and competitiveness. Gilligan's research indicates that masculine identity development is consistently confirmed by same gender peers who are largely influential in the development of masculine characteristics. Research also suggests that roles must be validated by their peers and often creates the long lasting impressions of what it means to be a man. Gilligan (1993) explains that males are more competitive, less apt to collaborate with one another, and are more rule and authority bound than females. There is a presence between male interactions of who can outlast, outpace, and overpower the others. During adolescence and young adulthood it becomes more important for males to be triumphant on the athletic field. If males are successful in the classroom or in leadership positions they are not labeled manly by their peers, unless they are also successful in sports while holding those positions (Gilbert & Gilbert 1998).

Considering the above literature and research presented in Chapter II it can be concluded that the survey conducted by the researcher is a fractional example of previous arguments. Results certainly suggest that further research in this area of student leadership is needed and can assist in successful student engagement.

While not all of the leadership themes returned data of significant differences between females and males, the results displayed the areas of differences and areas of similarities between the two genders and their leadership characteristics. The leadership theme of nurture returned the highest significance of difference which is in alignment with the literature presented in Chapter II. Nurturing would be considered an adjective to describe females and their mannerisms, not necessarily a typical adjective to describe males. The questions contained items of showing encouragement, helping others to feel comfortable, being aware of group members' problems, treating others fairly, using evaluations, and disclosing one's own feelings and thoughts. Research has identified those traits as primarily female characteristics and it was fascinating to identify the leadership theme of nurture to have the highest

significance of difference. One could argue that nurture would be the most obvious area of leadership that differs between females and males, due to the traits associated with nurturing qualities. Males have never been depicted as nurturing humans in society. Females have consistently had the role of nurturers and care givers. Nurturing within leadership could be attributed to a variety of tasks or relationships. Females may be more apt to nurture a relationship or new member, while males take on authoritative roles and dictate tasks.

The first research question sought to find data identifying if females and males possess different leadership characteristics. The forty question survey provided the researcher the ability to identify areas of similarities and areas where differences occur. As described above, nurture resulted in the highest difference and the leadership theme of support resulted with no significant differences; while those two themes of leadership are similar, they differ in emotional qualities. Nurture is a personality trait that displays caring gestures, motherly expressions, and emotion, while support could be expressed by working together, helping a friend, and even providing advice, which would not necessarily be deemed feminine only qualities.

Responsibility, authority, achievement, and collaboration each returned one question of statistical difference. From those responses a conclusion can be drawn that the female and male students who participated in this study have more similarities than differences in leadership characteristics. The similarity of the leadership theme of support between the female and male students is overwhelming with a range of 0.959-0.209. It can be speculated that authority and achievement are two leadership themes that would be more identified with male leadership characteristics, according the literature presented in Chapter II. However as researchers and professionals expand their knowledge of gender identity development, we can question if previous gender identity theories are still as applicable. The results do however provide higher educational professionals more knowledge in the ability to train, advise, and guide their female and male student leaders. Professionals can use this research has a starting point for their own research projects, while also challenge previous theories. Student affairs professionals have the opportunity to implement training models that reflect gender identity theories that are

appropriate for their environment. Using theories within training and following up with assessment can provide professionals with more insight and higher levels of retention. In many situations advisors and professionals use personality activities to help introduce the variety of personalities, which could serve as an introductory to gender identity activities. Addressing the leadership characteristics of all genders could help open discussion and present new ideas of female and male student leadership, thus allowing the student organization and members to be forward thinking and proactive in all around individual development.

The researcher's second research question sought to identify the differences of leadership characteristics, if any were present. As reviewed above and within Chapter IV, it is important to consider the areas of responsibility, collaboration, authority, and achievement that differ for female and male student leaders. Each of those leadership themes presented statistical differences for one question within each of those categories: it is important for researchers to continue extending the knowledge base of those differences. Those leadership themes are vast and expand into a variety of leadership skills and positions. The data reveals for nine of the ten questions females and males agreed on the statements of collaboration, a quality that professionals value. Collaboration is a theme taking higher education by storm, representing a great leadership asset to implement at the student level. The one question that revealed a difference was in regard to goals being dictated. Male participants were much more in the affirmative of their response than the female participants. The characteristics of dictating would be a quality that is more identifiable to males than females. Both females and males were most similar in the statement that asked participants to agree or disagree that they share members' ideas. Those two questions, both of which categorized under collaboration, focused on different components of leadership; yet, were part of the same idea of leadership.

Taking that same approach of reviewing the leadership theme of authority, nine questions were categorized in that theme and two of those questions had very different statistical results. Participants were asked to agree or disagree with "using fear as a leader to get goals accomplished." Both males and females were similar in their responses with the mean score being 2 and a standard deviation of 1.335 and

alpha coefficient of 1.000 indicating strong disagreement with the use of fear. Females and males did, however, differ with the statement of "using punishment within their leadership style." The male participants much more strongly agreed with that statement, while female participants had a higher frequency of strongly disagreeing with the statement. The alpha coefficient of 0.015 revealed that significant difference. Punishment could be viewed as a dictatorship, not a leadership style that has been identified as a female leadership characteristic, at this time. Both of those questions are considered a quality or style of authority, which have different views from females and males.

As a result of the data it can be concluded that there are more similarities than differences between female and male student leaders, which would contradict components of the literature presented within this research thesis. Literature presented in Chapter II highlight the tendencies of behavior, norms of emotion, and societal expectations of females and males. The literature provides a reader to believe and understand the differences among females and males and how that correlates with student leadership. Females have societal expectations of being emotional, understanding, patient, and nurturing, while males have societal norms of being authoritative, demanding, strong, and emotionless. Research points out that when females engage in leadership they have few choices with their leadership style. They have the option to lead as a female by being caring, patient, and democratic or they can take on male leadership traits and abandon their gender identity. For males society only expects them to achieve high status in certain leadership positions, while mainly focusing on their achievements athletically or socially. Taking a leadership position must be approved by their peers and done with demanding style. Previously males have been limited to leadership positions within student governing bodies. For both females and males being a leader compromises gender identity and societal expectations.

With the data of the current research project revealing small differences and high frequencies of similarities, it can be argued that the pool of participants go against the grain of the literature. Societal norms may have changed. Some speculations of the researcher question if we as humans have evolved. Social norms

and perceptions have changed dramatically in areas of sexual behavior and relationships, which would lead an individual to consider that our attitudes and behaviors have changed. The researcher also speculates that the growing efforts in society and education towards individuals who identify as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and those who are questioning, have had an impact on gender identity development. A growing understanding of evolving genders and personal relations can skew the earlier data of gender identities. As society expands into new areas of sexual identity and relationships, individuals will create updated social norms and behaviors.

Does this present study represent female and male students as whole, not entirely; it does however provide a knowledge base and understanding of student leadership and engagement. Due to the limitations of the pool of participants it can be asked if the present pool of students accurately represents the, at larger population. However, the small pool can be used to assist professionals in the areas of residence hall councils, student activities programming board, and student government. The results can also provide understanding of what leadership characteristics students are implementing and identify with. The data can be used to strengthen areas of leadership advising as professionals deem necessary. Resources can also be allocated more efficiently in regards to training, recruitment, and development. By having a stronger knowledge base, resources and time can be used more effectively and appropriately.

The third research question was designed to identify which student organizations females and males joined. The survey was not able to address that research question. Demographics and the survey questions did not provide information that would allow the researcher to provide proper conclusions in that area. The information gathered through the survey can assist with membership recruitment and retention, by implementing training that challenges the leadership development of student leaders. Further research could branch off and identify which areas of leadership female and male students are seeking, before researching leadership characteristics.

Data were also collected on five other variables that are important to consider in the higher education community. The researcher tested five variables that did not directly answer the research questions, but were helpful in understanding student development in leadership. Three of the variables returned data that revealed significant differences; gender, which supports the researcher's literature review, grade point average, and age. By testing the survey as a whole with the variable of gender, the data provided support to the overall results of gender and the leadership themes that were tested. The survey results provided the researcher with more knowledge of the participant pool and their leadership characteristics. As a whole the forty survey items received a difference between genders, which supports the literature and previous hypothesis. It is interesting, though, that as a whole that gender as one variable returns a difference, but as it is broken into categories, the results return one leadership theme of statistical difference.

It was, however, of interest to find that students who reside on and off campus did not differ statistically. This is not what the researcher had expected to discover due, to the large effort of training and development put forth in the communities by student affairs. Professionals within residential life may be able to use this data to evaluate their leadership training efforts and focus on various components of leadership. It is often believed and marketed that students who live on campus will engage and develop more so than students who reside off campus. The data can help professionals in housing areas to reevaluate their efforts and create new assessment pieces that increase leadership within their communities. Secondly, it was interesting to find that the data revealed no significant difference among students with the variable of academic class. This is important to consider due higher education professionals and the focus placed on student development. Professionals may find this data frustrating or eye opening. Higher education can assess the efforts towards leadership development and begin to review the effects of their strategies. It can be assumed that each year our student leaders acquire stronger leadership characteristics and these results prompt the researcher to believe professionals' efforts have not been as effective.

Overall, the recommendations from this project cause the researcher to believe that higher education professionals can improve leadership development tactics. The survey data reveal that our female and male students do differ slightly in some areas and more so in other areas. On the whole it is critical to focus on creating a healthy and well balanced environment, encouraging students to be comfortable and confident. Professionals can create training activities that can be tailored to the demographics of the organization and also create more challenging exercises for students as they progress through their experiences. Within housing, professionals can implement new ideas and activities built from gender identity and leadership development. By creating new efforts and activities a statistically significant difference may arise between the leadership experiences of on campus residents compared to off campus living students. Leadership experiences and activities can be adapted to the skills being used and the skills that are absent from the demographics and individual students. Also as professionals it should be addressed and challenged that the students did not report statistically significant differences of leadership characteristics when using the variable of academic class. If freshmen have the same leadership characteristics and beliefs of leadership as seniors, perhaps we have not challenged them. Have we provoked any new ideas? The data provides great insight into the areas of leadership, indicating that professionals can expand and strengthen strategies. Professionals can take the data and continue to expand their knowledge base on gender leadership development, which will continue to play a vital role within campus environments.

Recommendations for further research would include the delimitation of the researcher failing to recruit and use data of ethnicity. Various amounts of research highlight leadership differences among students of various ethnicities and socioeconomic statuses. Researching those theories and implementing a study that can identify differences and similarities among students who vary in ethnicity and socioeconomic status can contribute to the underlying knowledge of student leadership development. Another recommendation for further research would be to first identify where and when female and male students are leaders. It would be useful for practical and research purposes to have a better understanding of what leadership

positions appeal to females and males. It may provide more insight into the various roles female and males play on. Researchers should also expand the number of females and males that participate in the study. The present study was limited, due to the number of students active within the three student organizations and a disproportionate number of female participants. Expanding the participant pool, can provide better representation of female and male student leaders.

The results of the present study also create areas of recommendations for student affairs professionals. Practitioners can now begin to challenge the status quo and utilize a variety of theories to create leadership environments that are conducive to all genders. Gender identity and societal expectations can become part of the training to create new avenues for leadership activities. As reviewed in Chapter V, housing and student affairs professionals should constantly assess their leadership development training, to ensure they are providing in depth training that continues to challenge students, as they progress through moral development and individual development. Higher education will continue to grow and expand. Leadership will continue to be challenged by society and students. Keeping up with the increasing pace will be challenging, but will offer great opportunities for advising and growth.

In conclusion, the research creates more insight and questioning into the status quo of gender identity and its relation to leadership development. Many speculations have arisen from the literature and data that create more interest into female and male student leaders. Our evolution as humans and the impact it has on theory of human traits and characteristics should be examined.

As higher education discusses and debates female and male students, researchers can continue to delve into student leadership. Practitioners and professionals should challenge and grow in the area of research, so that they can provide the most effective leadership training that identifies with the needs and cognitive growth of undergraduate students. Keeping pace with research and society can be difficult, but can also ensure that the educational community is fulfilling its goals. The research will continue to grow in areas of gender identity with the development of new genders and human relations, which have a great impact on our students and student leaders. Student leadership and student involvement are some of

the most rewarding experiences for undergraduate students, their skills will create their growing identity and outlook on life. Student affairs creates the environment for student evolution and even more so assist with their gender and individual identity. The researcher's final thought is to challenge professionals and students to always question and test the status quo.

REFERNCES

Arnold, R.E., (2004). Demographics and issues of retention. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 21*(18), 47.

Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years. Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W. (1984) Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 518-529

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1996) Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 123-134.

Astin, H. S., & Kent, L. (1983). Gender roles in transition: Research and policy implications for higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 54,* 309324.

Astin, H.S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross generational study of leaders and social change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bales, R. F. (1950). *Interaction process analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist,37,* 122–147.

Bass, B. M. (1981). *Handbook of Leadership*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-32.

Berkowitz, M. W. & Grych, J. H. (1998). Fostering goodness: Teaching parents to facilitate children's moral development. *Journal of Child Development, 38* (5), 318-329.

Biernat, M. (1991). Gender stereotypes and the relationships between masculinity and femininity: A developmental analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(3), p. 351-365.

Blimling, G., The influence of college residence halls on students. IN J. Smart (ed.) *Higher Education: Handbook of theory and Research.* New York: Agathon Press, 1993.

Bohan, J. S. (1997). Regarding gender: Essential, constructionism, and feminist

psychology. In M.M. George & S. N. Davis (Eds.). Toward a new psychology of gender (p. 31-48). New York: Routledge.

Chee, K. H., Pino, N.W., & Smith, W. L. (2005). Gender differences in the academic ethic and academic achievement. *College Student Journal, 39*(3), 604-618.

Chemers, M. M. (2002) Efficacy and effectiveness: Integrating models of leadership and intelligence. In Riggio, R. E., Murphy, S. E., & Pirozzolo, F. J. (Eds.) *Multiple intelligences and leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chickering, A., & Kuper, E. Educational outcomes for commuters and residents. *Educational Record*, 1971, *52*, 255-261

Chodorow, N. (1978) The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender. *Berkeley.* University of California Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capitol in the creation of human capitol. *The American Journal of Sociology, 94*, 95-120.

DesJardins, S. L. , McCall, B. P., Ahlburg, D. A., & Moye, M. J. (2002). Adding a timing light to the "tool box". *Research in Higher Education, 43*(1), 83-114.

Eagly, A.H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14,* 807–834.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: a meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 233-256.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Pyschology, 60*(5), 685-710.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109,* 573-598.

Eagly, A. H., Karau, S.J., & Makhijani, M.G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 125-145.

Eagly, A. H. & Makhijani, M. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 92*(111), 3-10.

Eagly, A.H., Makhijani, M.G., & Klonsky, B.G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: a meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111*(1), 322.

Emerick, A. (2005). The effects of single-sex student leadership positions on leadership style used, perceptions of effective leadership, self-efficacy, domain identification, intent to lead in the future, and perceptions and evaluations of leaders. Retrieved June 14, 2007.

Forest, L., Hotelling, K., & Kuk, L. (1984). The elimination of sexism in the university environment. *Fortune Magazine,* November 14, 2005.

Gilbert, R., & Gilbert, P. (1998). *Masculinity goes to school.* New York: Routledge.

Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harper, S.R. (2006). Creating a cyclical culture of leadership and engagement: A model for black males achievement at HBCU's. In D.N. Byrne (Ed.), *Models for success: Supporting the achievement and relation of Black males at HBCU's.* (p.149-170). New York.

Harper, S. R. (2006). The measure of a man: Conceptualizations of masculinity. *Berkely Journal of Sociology, 33*(2), 89-107.

Harper, S.R., Carini, R.M., Bridges, B.K., & Hayek, J.C. (2004). Gender differences in student engagement among African American undergraduates at historically black colleges and universities. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(3) 271-284.

Harper, C. & Sax, L. (2007). Origins of the gender gap: Pre-college and college influences on differences between men and women. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(6), 669-694.

Hernandez, K., Hogan, S., Hathaway, C., & Lovell, C. (1999) Analysis of the literature on the impact of student involvement on the student development and learning: more questions than answers. *NASPA Journal, 36*(3) 129-156.

Hoffman, J.L. (2002) The impact of student co-curricular involvement on student success: Racial and religious differences. Journal *of College Student Development, 43*(5), 712-737.

Hoyt, C., Murphy, S., Halverson, S., & Watson C. (2003). Group leadership: Efficacy and effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 7,* 259-274.

Hussar, W. J. (2005). Projections of Education Statistics to 2014. National Center for Education Statistics: Thirty Third Edition Jossey-Bass.

Keahone, R. O. (1984) *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). The psychology of moral development. Harper and Row: New York.

Kolb, J. A. (1997). Are we still stereotyping leadership? *Small Group Research, 28*(3), 370-380.

Kuh, G.D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(2), 123-155.

Kuh, G.D. & Hu, S. (2002). Being (dis)engaged in educationally purposeful activities: The influences of student and institutional characteristics. *Research in Higher Education, 43*. 555-575.

Kuh, G. D. & Lund, J.P. (1994). What students gain from participating in student government. *New Directions for Student Services, 66,* 5-17.

Kuh, G.D. & Pike, G.R. (1999). The relationship between institutional mission and students' involvement outcomes. *Research in Higher Education,44*(2), 241-261.

Kuh, G. D. (2005). Seven steps for taking student learning seriously. *Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 13*(3).

Liddell, D.L., & Davis, T.L. (1996). The measure of moral orientation: Reliability and validity evidence. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*, 485-493.

Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine leadership, or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys*. New York: Times Books.

Luzzo, D. A. (1995) Gender differences in college students' career maturity and perceived barriers in career development. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*(3), 319-322.

McCannon, M. & Bennett, P. (1996). Choosing to participate or not: A study of college students' involvement in student organizations. *College Student Journal, 30*(3), 313-316.

Miller-Bernal, L. (1993). Single sex versus coeducational environments: A comparison of women students' experiences at four colleges. *American Journal of Education*, *102*(11), 23–54.

Miller, C.D. & Kraus, M. (2004). Participating but not leading: Women's under representation in student government leadership positions. *College Student Journal, 38*(3), 423-427.

Murphy, S. E. (2002). Leader self-regulation: The role of self-efficacy and multiple intelligences. In Riggio, R. E., Murphy, S. E., & Pirozzolo, F. J. (Eds.) *Multiple intelligences and leadership.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pascarella, E. (1985). The influence of on-campus living versus commuting to college on intellectual and interpersonal self concept. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *26,* 292-299.

Pascarella, E., and Terenzini, P.(1981) Resident arrangement, student/faculty relationships, And freshmen-year educational outcomes. *Journal of College StudentPersonnel, 22,* 147-156.

Schroeder, C.C., Mable, P., and Associates. *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (1994)

Sullivan, K., and Sullivan, A.(1980). Adolescent-parent separation. *Developmental Psychology*, *16,* 93-98.

Terenzini, P.T & Pascarella, E, T. (1994). Living with myths. *Change, 26*(1), 28-32.

Viadero, D. (1998). AAUW study finds girls making some progress, bug gap remain. *Education Week, 18*(7), 9-10.

Whitt, E. J. (1994). I can be anything!: Student leadership in three women's colleges. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*(3), 198–207.

IRB Certification of Exemption - Shaverdi, #08-028

Thursday, February 14, 2008 8:56:05 AM

From: eiuirb@www.eiu.edu

To: amshaverdi@eiu.edu

Cc: nadler@eiu.edu; casiddens@eiu.edu

February 14, 2008

Amber Shaverdi

Counseling and Student Development

Thank you for submitting the research protocol titled, "Male & Female Student Leadership Characteristics" for review by the Eastern Illinois University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has reviewed this research protocol and effective 2/12/2008, has certified this protocol as Exempt from Further Review. The protocol has been given the IRB number 08-028.

The classification of this protocol as Exempt from Further Review is valid only for the research activities, timeline, and subjects described in the above named protocol. IRB policy requires that any proposed changes to this protocol must be reported to, and approved by, the IRB before being implemented. You are also required to inform the IRB immediately of any problems encountered that could adversely affect the health or welfare of the subjects in this study. Please contact me, or the Compliance Coordinator at 581-8576, in the event of an emergency. All correspondence should be sent to:

Institutional Review Board

c/o Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

Telephone: 217-581-8576

Fax: 217-581-7181

Email: eiuirb@www.eiu.edu

Thank you for your cooperation, and the best of success with your research.

John Best, Chairperson

Institutional Review Board

Telephone: 217-581-6412

Email: jbbest@eiu.edu

APPENDIX B

SURVEY

Thinking about your leadership qualities, please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements. Please select the number corresponding using the following scale:

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Strongly Agree

1. I show confidence in my group members.
2. Group members' ideas are sought.
3. I use fear to get tasks accomplished.
4. I clarify my own role within the group.
5. I have trust in my group members.
6. It is the whole group's responsibility to achieve the organization's goals.
7. I use threats when necessary.
8. I use rewards as an incentive.
9. I encourage group members to do quality work.
10. I help group members get along.
11. I act friendly with members of the group.
12. Decisions are made as a group.
13. I set standards of performance for group members.
14. I help others feel comfortable in the group.
15. Organization goals are dictated.
16. Group members' ideas are used constructively.
17. The group establishes organizational goals.
18. I use punishment in my leadership style.
19. I know the problems faced by group members.
20. I make the decisions.
21. I complete review functions without the input of my group members.
22. There is resistance to my leadership.
23. I provide criteria for what is expected of the group.
24. Evaluations of group members are used.

25. I show concern for the personal well-being of others.
26. My group members are comfortable talking to me about tasks.
27. I show little confidence in my group members.
28. I dictate group goals.
29. I tell group members what they are supposed to do.
30. I make suggestions about how to solve problems.
31. I respond favorably to suggestions made by others.
32. I make my perspective clear to others.
33. I treat others fairly.
34. I develop a plan of action for the group.
35. I behave in a predictable manner toward group members.
36. I define role responsibilities for each group member.
37. I communicate with group members.
38. I provide a plan for how the work is to be done.
39. I show flexibility in making decisions.
40. I disclose thoughts and feelings to group members.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY QUESTIONS & LEADERSHIP THEMES

Support

1. I show confidence in my group members.
5. I have trust in my group members.
8. I use rewards as an incentive.
11. I act friendly with members of the group.
25. I show concern for the personal well being of others.
31. I respond favorably to suggestions made by others.
35. I behave in a predictable manner toward group members.

Authority

3. I use fear to get tasks accomplished.
7. I use threats when necessary.
18. I use punishment in my leadership style.
21. I complete review functions without the input of my group members.
22. There is resistance to my leadership.
27. I show little confidence in my group members.
29. I tell group members what they are supposed to do.
36. I define role responsibilities for each group members.

Collaboration

2. Group members' ideas are sought.
4. I clarify my own role within the group.
10. I help group members to get along.
12. Decisions are made as a group.
16. Group members' ideas are used constructively.
26. My group members are comfortable talking to me about tasks.
30. I make suggestions about how to solve problems.
37. I communicate with group members.
39. I show flexibility in making decisions.

Nurture

14. I help others feel comfortable in the group.

24. Evaluations of the group members are used.

33. I treat others fairly.

40. I disclose thoughts and feelings to group members.

Achievement

13. I set standards of performance for group members.

15. Organization goals are dictated.

17. The group establishes organizational goals.

34. I develop a plan of action for the group.

38. I provide a plan for how the work is to be done.

Responsibility

20. I make the decisions.

23. I provide criteria for what is expected of the group.

28. I dictate group goals.